

## REMARKS

### *Specification Amendment*

5 The paragraph starting on page 17, line 28 and ending on page 18, line 19 has been amended to correct an informality; the word “in” was omitted in the originally filed application.

### *Claim Status*

10 Claims 1-8 and 10-31 are currently amended. Claims 50-58 are new. Claims 9 and 32-49 are canceled.

Claims 1-8 and 10-31 are amended in regards to the 101 rejections as discussed below. In addition, independent claim 1 is amended to include the elements of original claim 9. Support for new claim 50 can be found at least on page 11, lines 15-29. Support for new  
15 claims 51-58 can be found at least from page 12, line 14 to page 14, line 5. In addition, support for new claim 52 can be found at least in original claim 9 and support for new claim 57 can be found at least on page 9, lines 15-16. All pages and line numbers refer to the application as originally filed. No new matter is introduced.

20

### *Regarding 35 U.S.C. § 101 Rejections*

Claims 1-31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter.

In reply, claims 1-8 and 10-31 are currently amended to be directed to a method of hooking up two users using a hook-up assistant (HUA). Applicants submits that the currently amended claims are now statutory.

5    ***Regarding 35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections***

Claims 1-11 and 13-31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Glitho et al (US 2004/0078256) and Hesse (US 2003/0174826). Claim 12 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Glitho et al (US 2004/0078256) and Hesse (US 2003/0174826) and Creamer et al. (US 6735294).

10

With respect to independent claim 1, Applicant traverses this rejection on the grounds that not all elements are taught by the combination of references. It is noted that claim 1 is currently amended to include elements of original claim 9. In particular, claim 1 requires ***automatically activating the HUA*** in response to an ***incomplete telephone call*** made by a first of said at least two people to a second of said at least two people. In other words, the HUA responsible for determining an appropriate time, scheduling, and initiating the event or activity is automatically activated due to an incomplete telephone call between the at least two people.

15

20

The Examiner rejected original claim 9 and cites paragraphs 42, 58, 76, and 77 of Hesse as teaching the above element of automatic activation of the HUA. It is noted that Hesse is directed to a videoconferencing system for a plurality of stations, such as in a prison environment. The cited text of Hesse does not teach or suggest anything to do with ***activating a HUA from an incomplete telephone call***. In particular, paragraph 42 of

Hesse describes scheduling a conference and storing records of completed and cancelled conferences. Paragraph 58 describes stations for having the conference. Paragraphs 76-77 describe scheduling and revising the schedule for conferences based on availabilities and capabilities of participants. None of these paragraphs describe activating a HUA from an incomplete telephone call.

In summary, Applicant traverses the rejection of claim 1 on the grounds that the cited text of Hesse does not teach (1) a hook-up assistant for determining an appropriate time, scheduling an event or activity, and initiating the event or activity; (2) *automatically activating* the hook-up assistant; and (3) automatically activating the hook-up assistant based on an *incomplete telephone call*.

For at least these reasons, Applicant holds claim 1 patentable over the cited references as the cited references do not include all elements of claim 1. Claims 2-8 and 10-31 depend from claim 1, so the above arguments in connection with claim 1 are also responsive to the rejections of claims 2-8 and 10-31. Accordingly, Applicant holds that claims 1-8 and 10-31 are allowable over the cited references.

## CONCLUSION

The Applicant hereby submits a bona fide attempt to address the rejections in the Office Action and argues why the present claims are different from the art of record. The  
5 Examiner is sincerely invited to telephone the undersigned at 650-424-0100 for clarification or any suggested actions such as an Examiner's Amendment to accelerate prosecution and forward the present application to allowance. Allowance of the claims now in the application is kindly requested.

10 Respectfully submitted,

/ Trieu T. Mai /

15 Trieu T. Mai  
Reg. No. 61,354  
Lumen Patent Firm, Inc.  
2345 Yale Street, Second Floor  
Palo Alto, CA 94306  
650-424-0100 (phone)

20